

1401 H Street NW Suite 600

Washington DC

20005-2164

Tel (202) 326-7300 Fax (202) 326-7333

www.usta.org

NOTICE AND SUMMARY OF EX PARTE PRESENTATION

February 25, 2005

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Portals II, Room TW-A325 Washington, DC 20554

Re: Level 3 Communications LLC Petition for Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. §160(c) from

Enforcement of 47 U.S.C. §251(g), Rule 51.701(b)(1), and Rule 69.5(b), WC Docket

No. 03-266

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On February 24, 2005, Jeffrey S. Lanning, and I, on behalf of the United States Telecom Association (USTA), along with five representatives from USTA member companies, met with Christopher Libertelli, Legal Advisor to Chairman Michael K. Powell, regarding the above-referenced matter. The representatives from USTA member companies were Kevin Albaugh of North Pittsburgh Telephone, Trenton D. Boaldin of Epic Touch Co, Robert D. Binder of Citizens/Frontier Telephone, Aubrey Judy, III of CT Communications Inc., and Glenn Rabin of ALLTEL Corp.

The purpose of this meeting was to urge the Commission to deny Level 3's Petition. The participants discussed: (1) the practical difficulty of identifying traffic from Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) providers, which makes implementation of Level 3's proposal costly, time consuming, and impractical, and will encourage further gaming of the intercarrier compensation system; (2) the reasons the so-called rural carve-out in Level 3's petition would not work due to how local interconnection and transit service arrangements work between rural ILECs and neighboring large ILECs, leaving rural ILECs unable to collect access charges; (3) the asymmetrical treatment under Level 3's petition of calls originating on the PSTN and terminating on VoIP networks, which will still generate terminating access charges, compared with the proposed treatment of calls originating on VoIP networks and terminating on the PSTN, which would not generate terminating access charges; (4) the ways in which Level 3's petition is a misuse of the forbearance process because it requires substantial additional rulemaking to implement and actually seeks imposition of one price (reciprocal compensation) for another price (access charges), which is a regulatory change not a forbearance from regulation; and (5) how Level 3's proposal would negatively impact broadband deployment, particularly in rural areas.

In accordance with Section 1.1206(b)(2) of the Commission's rules, this letter is being filed electronically with your office.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

James W. Olson

Sgraes WOlson

Vice President Law and General Counsel

cc: Christopher Libertelli